

Rochester Institute of Technology RIT Scholar Works

Theses

Thesis/Dissertation Collections

1999

Teamwork and decision making environment at Koo-Yoo-Hah motor company: A Case study

Siriruk Angsanant

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Angsanant, Siriruk, "Teamwork and decision making environment at Koo-Yoo-Hah motor company: A Case study" (1999). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology. Accessed from

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Thesis/Dissertation Collections at RIT Scholar Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of RIT Scholar Works. For more information, please contact ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

Teamwork and Decision Making Environment
At Koo-Yoo-Hah Motor Company: A Case Study

By

Siriruk Angsanant

A project submitted to
The Faculty of the school of Food, Hotel and Tourism Management
At
Rochester Institute of Technology
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree
Of
Master of Science

July, 1999

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
School of Food, Hotel and Travel Management
Department of Graduate Studies

M.S. Hospitality-Tourism Management
Presentation of Thesis/Project Findings

Name: Siriruk Angsanant Date: 7/29/99 SS#: _____

Title of Research: Teamwork and Decision Making Environment

Specific Recommendations: (Use other side if necessary.)

Thesis Committee: (1) Dr. Edward B. Stockham (Chairperson)

(2) _____

OR (3) _____

Faculty Advisor: _____

Number of Credits Approved: 2 Credits

29 July 1999

Date Committee Chairperson's Signature

7/29/99

Date Department Chairperson's Signature

Note: This form will not be signed by the Department Chairperson until all corrections, as suggested in the specific recommendations (above) are completed.

cc: Departmental Student Record File - Original
Student

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
 School of Food, Hotel and Travel Management
 Department of Graduate Studies

M.S. Hospitality-Tourism Management
Statement Granting or Denying Permission to Reproduce Thesis/Project

The author of a thesis or project should complete one of the following statements and include this statement as the page following the title page.

Title of thesis/project: Teamwork and Decision Making Environment

I, Siriruk Angsanant, hereby (grant) permission to the
 Wallace Memorial Library of R.I.T., to reproduce the document titled above in
 whole or part. Any reproduction will not be for commercial use or profit.

OR

I, Siriruk Angsanant, prefer to be contacted each time a
 request for reproduction is made. I can be reached at the following address:

3390/23 Radpaow 130/2 Rd.

Bangkapi Bangkok Thailand (10240)

7/29/99

Date

 Signature

ABSTRACT

TEAMWORK AND DECISION MAKING IN KOW-YOO-HAH MOTOR COMPANY (THAILAND): A 1999 CASE STUDY

This is a case study on the detection of differences that have occurred in the structure and process that support effective teamwork and decision making among branches: Khonkaen Yone, Sarakram, Leiy, and Head office in Kow-Yoo-Hah Motor company (Thailand.) A comparative approach was considered to use in this research. The data collected from the four different branches were compared to each other in order to find out how they are different.

The instrument used in this case study was the organization Team survey instrument developed by Boone and kilmann. The purpose of this case study was to look at differences that occurred among the four branches in the company in 1999. The survey was conducted in January 1999 at the four branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah Motor Company (Thailand.) The questionnaires were administered to employees currently working at the company. Participation was done on a volunteer basic, and individual confidentiality was maintained. There were 35 participants in Khonkaen branch, 52 participants in Sarakram branch, 36 participants in Leiy branch, and 52 participants in Head office.

The questionnaire is composed of four parts. Part I, the respondents were briefly asked to describe their jobs. In Part II, there are forty-six random place questions. The set of forty-six questions was divided in ten main factors: factor1-Multiple Input and Alternatives, factor 2- Problem Identification, factor 3-Rewards for good decision, factor 4-Use of group efforts, factor 5-Politics, factor 6 Resource Adequacy, factor 7-leadership

of Members, factor 8-Flexibility in Work performance, factor 9-Restrain for Decision Making, and factor 10-Ideas in workplace.

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS.) Significant differences of factors between the four branches were determined using group T-value. T-value and P-Values between 0.1 and 0.01 were used to detect any significant differences. Consequently, fifteen comparisons were found to have statistically significant differences.

Between Khonkaen Yone and Sarakram branches, there were significant differences in factor 2-Problem Identification (mean = 3.8:3.55, T-value = 203, df = 73.76, p-Value = 0.045), factor 3-Reward for good decision mean = 3.76: 3.25, T-value = 2.89, df = 76.99, p-value = 0.005), factor 6-Resource adequacy (mean = 3.56: 3.27, T-value = 2.81, df = 55.98, p-value = 0.007), and factor 8-Flexibility in workplace (mean = 3.31: 3.11, T-value = 1.83, df = 74.84, p-value = 0.071) Between Khonkaen Yone and Leiy branches, the significant differences were in factor 5-Use of the group efforts (mean = 2.8: 3.28, T-value = -2.95, df = 68.07, p-value = 0.004) , and factor 9-Restrain for decision making (mean = 2.5 : 2.85, T-value = -2.14, df = 68.09, p-value = 0.809) Between Khonkaen Yone and Head office, Factor 2-problem identification (mean = 3.8 : 3.48. T-value = 2.45, df = 79.81, p-value = 0.017), factor 3-Reward for good decision (mean = 3.76 : 3.41, T-value = 2.21, df = 79.81, p-value = 0.031), factor 6-Resource adequacy (mean = 3.56 : 3.31, T-value = 2.51, df = 83.46, p-value = 0.014), and factor 7-Leadership of members (mean = 3.31 : 3.24, T-value = 0.68, df = 64.83, p-value = 0.499) were found to have significant differences. Between Sarakram and Leiy branches, factor

3-Rewards for good decision (mean = 3.25: 3.55, T-value = -1.88, df = 85.04, p-value = 0.064), factor 4-Use of group efforts (mean = 2.92: 3.28, T-value = -2.78, df = 62.72, p-value = 0.007), and factor 9-Restrain for decision making (mean = 2.47: 2.85, T-value = -2.45 df = 74.03, p-value = 0.017) were found to have significant differences. Between Sarakram and Head office, only factor 7 Leadership (mean = 4.17: 3.9, T-value = 1.91, df = 99.79, p-value = 0.059) was found to have significant difference. Between Leiy branch and Head office, factor 4-Use of group efforts (mean = 3.28 : 2.9, T-value = 2.55, df = 81.78, p-value = 0.014) was the only one to have significant differences.

Part III of the questionnaire asked for ranking the top five problem areas in each branch of the company. In Head office, Company policy and strategies was considered to be the first big problem. The second big problem was Finance and budgeting. The third problem was Motivation to do job better. The fourth problem was Adequate training to do job and the last problem was Personal.

The recommendation for this study is that the company should find out and understand employee expectations in order to have employees satisfy its customers, and solve their current top problems.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Dr. Stockham for his guidance through the duration of my project. I would like to thank to Mr. Prayoon and Mr. Prayong for providing a convenience to conduct a survey at Kow-Yoo-Hah Motor Company (Thailand.) I would like to thank you to all of my friends: Peter, Som, Satoko and phaphan for their helps. Furthermore, I would like to thank to Tui to encourage and help me to complete my project. The final thanks are to my families for their love and encouragement and their supports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction and background.....	1
Problem statement.....	4
Purpose.....	4
Significance.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Sample.....	5
Instrument.....	5
Administration.....	9
Data Analysis	9
Hypothesis.....	9
Assumptions.....	10
Scope of Limitation.....	10
Long Range Consequences.....	10
Definition of terms.....	10
CHAPTER II: LITERA TURELEVIEW.....	12
The significance of Teamwork.....	12
Team Building.....	12

Group-Team Decision Making Environment.....	14
CHAPTER III: RESULTS AND FINDING.....	18
Results and finding.....	18
Ranking of the five problem areas.....	29
CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	32
Conclusion.....	32
Recommendation.....	34
REFERENCE.....	37
APPENDIX: A.....	40
Questionnaire.....	41
APPENDIX: B.....	45
Table11: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch and Sarakram branch.....	46
Table12: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch and Leiy branch.....	47
Table 13: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch and Head office.....	48
Table 14: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Sarakram branch and Leiy branch.....	49
Table 15: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Sarakram branch and Head office.....	50
Table 16: detailed t-Test comparisons of factor means between Leiy branch and Head office.....	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Number

1. Demographic Data of respondents.....	20
2. Sex of respondents by branches	21
3. Age of respondents by branches	22
4. Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone and Sarakram branches	23
5. Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone and Leiy branches.....	24
6. Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone and Head office.....	26
7. Comparison of factor means between Sarakram and Leiy branches.....	27
8. Comparison of factor means between Sarakram and Head office.....	28
9. Comparison of factor means between Leiy branch and Head office.....	29
10. Ranking of problem areas by branches.....	31

Chapter I

Introduction

KOW-YOO-HAH Motor Inc. is an automotive dealership being known as the number one in market share in the Northeast of Thailand. This leadership has an auto service center for owner maintenance and check up. This shows that the company also wants to satisfy and maintain customers after the sale. According to the auto service center, most customers are satisfied with the condition of their cars. Some people may complain about certain issues such as tardiness in service delivery, the price of a spare part or not doing what the customer originally wanted done. For all the complaints gaps sometimes exist in the procedures used because of a lack of teamwork. Nowadays the company needs to think of ways to satisfy and maintain its customers since customers have many choices. The first step that the company should do is understanding employees' attitudes and finds out what they want before having them satisfy their customers.

Mr. Vinyu Kuvanan, the president of Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company, and his spouse, Mrs. Malin, started the automobile business where they were the distributors of spare parts for the Isuzu automobile. From the start, they had less than twenty employees. Because of the hard work and the vision of the presidents, the business has been growing from a small car distributor to one of the largest leading automobile distributor in the Northeast region of Thailand. The company also expanded its business into other commercial fields such as agriculture, construction and real estate, insurance, resort and hotel, and tourism. The management system at the Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company picks each person with the right skills for the right job. Until

the present day, the company has still worked under the policy of “giving the customer the best quality, price, and service”

When an organization grows large, it is hard for the family management to go over and solve problems in every department. Processes set forth by a company management sometimes fails to produce an adequate result because the company rarely examines the end results of its performance. The company does not directly take customers' complaints into consideration in improving the performance process. What is even worse is that sometimes the company realizes the complaints but does not think that it is profit generating. Some companies concentrate on service only at the selling point. In fact, service after the sale is also important to the company because the company can increase profit from the auto service center. Furthermore, it is probable that satisfied customers will come back and buy cars from the same company, or they might give a good recommendation about the company to someone who wants to buy a car. On the other hand, the company might loose its customers for future sales. This is simply because customers may be dissatisfied with the services received with their first purchase. Failure to cooperate as a team in the process leaves gaps during the service process. For instance, when customers want to buy cars, how can they find information, and whom can they talk to (operators, sales, managers, mechanics, financial officers, insurance officers etc.)? Before and after the sale is closed, employees in their departments need to work together as a team in order to get the task done. Problems can occur anywhere in the process even if the process in place. If everyone in the team gets along well together, problems can be solved easily and the task can be done quickly.

Therefore, this study looks into the working environment. The measurement of variables in the working environment is important because they can affect individuals directly and

indirectly through physical features, organizational structure and policy, supra personal factors and social climate (Moos, 1986)

Background

Most of the questions in the questionnaires are a critical incident questionnaires developed by Larry W. Boone and Ralph H. Killeen in order to measure the kinds of decisions made and the structures and processes supporting them in an organizational environment.

Janet Barnard (1992) adapted the questionnaire. Her research named “Decision Environment of Small Firms Experiencing Different Rates of Growth” It was to measure how decision-making variables work together to affect organizational success.

In 1993, Joanna Liu used an adapted version of the “Organizational Team Survey” in a pilot study that measured the decision-making environment in the meeting planning industry.

This survey has been using as a continued project in the hotel industry in Rochester, NY. It was started by Young-Yee Koo in 1994 using the “ Organizational Team Survey” to measure decision-making structures and processes in two hotels in Rochester, NY. In 1995, the instrument was use by Donald Stubblebine to show the differences in the process and structure that supported the organizational decisions from 1994-1995. In 1996, Nikhila Sridhar conducted the same instrument to compare the result between 1994 and 1996. At the same time, Salaya Chermsirivattana used the same psychometric instrument to compare decision and process at a local 210 room between 1994 and 1996, and 1995 and 1996.

Problem statement

In this day and age, a company needs to think of ways to satisfy and maintain its customers since customers have many choices. Employees are a significant part of a company's image, and when everyone on the team enjoys working together, it results in effective performance. Kow-Yoo-Ha company is running its business as a family one, even though executives always say that they are working as a team. Employees have to do what management wants without discussion. This might discourage employees from working effectively. As a result, the management does not know what levels of teamwork and decision making systems are present in its branches of the company.

Purpose

The purpose of the study is to analyze the collaboration of teamwork and decision making by using the Organization Team Survey and looking at the attitude of employees at the Kow-Yoo-Hah company. By so doing, the study aims to measure level of teamwork performance in the work environment of various branches of the company.

Significance

Undeniably, customers have choices; it is impossible to avoid competition. Furthermore, the competition can become fierce. Under today's highly competitive market, it is easy to loose customers to competitors if a company ignores good business practices. Everyone is a vital part of the company and should be diligent about implementing its service plan to become the first choice for customers. For sure, teamwork is important and demonstrates company pride. That is why this study points out the importance of teamwork and decision making. The study might be

of value to readers interested in the automotive dealership business or they can apply it to their own business.

Methodology

The project was a case study on detecting differences among four branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company. This case study is considered to be comparative research conducted in a present perspective among four branches of the company.

There are ten factors in this survey: (Multiple inputs and alternative, Problems identification and Organization, Rewards for good decision, Use of group efforts, Bureaucratic blocks and politics, Resource Adequacy, Leadership, flexibilities, restraints, and ideas) affecting the employee's decision-making process in the workplace. The data received from the questionnaire was correlated through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Sample

The sample of this research are all employees currently working at branch 1 (Khonkaen Yone), branch 2 (Saraburi), branch 3 (Lampang) and the Head office of Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company.

Instrument

Eighty percent of this questionnaire was developed by Boone and Kilman (1991). The rests were taken from the "Team-Work & Team-Roles Inventory" survey which developed by

Dr. Frederick S. Mumma. In order to adjust to the topic (Teamwork and the Decision-making environment) The survey is composed of four parts.

Part I, employees were asked to write briefly about their job.

Part II consisted of a critical incident questionnaire of 46 questions and randomly displayed. The questions are divided into ten factors that contribute to the effectiveness of team work and decision making in workplace. The following are ten factors and Cronbach's alpha value that measures the internal consistency of the items in each factor.

1. Inputs: Multiple inputs and alternatives (.68)

- Availability and use of information from many sources
- Generation and consideration of many possible solutions to problems
- Willingness of decision makers to try new ideas and take some risks
- Freedom to disagree with management
- Management support to carry out decision

2. Problems: Problem identification and organization (.69)

Accuracy of problem identification

- Establishment of clear objectives as basis for decisions
- Efficient problem solving skills of decision makers
- Accuracy of information from all parts of the organization

The case of getting things done by decision-makers.

3. Rewards: Rewards for good decisions(.63)

- Relationship between rewards and new ideas
- Effectiveness of performance measures
- Motivational outcomes of the reward and recognition system

4. Teamwork: Use of Group efforts (.62)

- Use of individuals vs. groups in decision making
- Regulation of decisions by a few powerful people or upper management
- Opportunity for input from others

5. Politics: Bureaucratic blocks and politics (.72)

- Degree that “red tape” and the politics and procedures will control decisions
- Resistance to change because of costs
- Political activity associated with decisions in the organization

6. Resources: Resources adequacy (.67)

- Access to and reliability of equipment used by decision makers
- Adequacy of physical resource to support the decision making process

7. Leadership: Leadership of members

- Ability to solve problems

Accept good suggestions that the team makes

- Support the group heading towards the goal

Respect in everyone's point of view.

8. Flexibility: Flexibility in work performance

- Management flexibly helps employees find several ways to approach the assignment
- Relaxation in the workplace

9. Restrain: Hold back for making decision

- Ability to work with confidence
- Care about team members too much
- Avoid taking leadership role

10. Ideas: Attitude in the workplace

- Believe that they are meaningful to the team
- Access ideas if they are poor quality
- Creativity on the job

Part III, there are thirteen problem areas listed in the section. The respondents are supposed to select the top five problem areas to their branches, and rank them in order from one being the highest problem area to five being the lowest problem area.

Part IV is the additional part which gives the demographic information such as sex, age, number of years working in the company, and number of years working in this current position.

The questionnaire (see appendix A) was subsequently translated in Thai.

Administration

The instrument was used for surveying employees in branch 1, branch 2, branch 3, and branch 4 of Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company in January 1999. The instrument was administered to all employees at the time they were working in their branches. Participation was on a volunteer basis and confidentiality was maintained.

Data Analysis

The data found were statistically analyzed through group t-test to find the difference between factor means in branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company.

Hypothesis

A reasonable expectation of this study was that the structure and processes that support teamwork and organization decision making from branch1 to branch2, branch1 to branch3, branch1 to branch4, branch2 to branch3, branch2 to branch4, and branch3 to branch4 were the same. The hypothesis that was tested was as follows.

Hypothesis:

H_0 : Factor Mean Branch1=Factor Mean Branch2

(There was no difference of factor means between branches in 6 comparisons)

H_a : Factor Mean Branch1 \neq Factor Mean Branch2

(There were differences of factor means between branches in 6 comparison)

Branch1 = Khonkaen Yone

Branch2 = Sarakram

Branch3 = Leiy

Branch4 = Head office

Assumptions

This research should be conducted apart from my bias toward or against the company since all of the questions were within the boundary that was made for the hypothesis.

It is assumed that both company and employees are dealing with each other fairly, so the survey is not designed to involve the compensation policy of the company. It is also assumed that the meaning of the questions was not lost during translating into the Thai language.

Scope and Limitation

This case study only looked at differences on teamwork and decision making structures of the four branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah Motor company (Thailand) in 1999. Another limitation was that the participants represented from all employees of the company should be able to read and understand the questionnaire.

Long Range Consequence

The consequences of this study should demonstrate the relationships between the impact of performance and the significance of teamwork. If the hypothesis is proved by the sample, the impact of this study will be vital to the company to solve the problems. Another problem that the company has not known before might occur during the interview; moreover, this might be the chance for the company to resolve the problem.

Definition of team

1. Longitudinal study: A research over a period of time to measure the rate of change in a sample.

2. T-test: The statistical procedures used to test whether two means or averages are the same or not.
3. Critical incident (psychometric) survey: A technique of mental measurement that time.
(Stubblebine, 1995)
4. Team building: The process of intentionally creating a team a newly formed or existing group of people.
5. Team: It generally means a group of people who work, play, or act together to achieve a common objective.
6. Teamwork: It generally used in business. Teamwork is formed to work together as a team.
For this study, teamwork involves the employees working as a team in Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company.

Chapter II

Literature Review

The topic to be reviewed is composed of the following:

- The significance of Teamwork
- Team Building
- Group-Team Decision Making Environment

The significance of Teamwork

In the field of business, teamwork is “a group of individuals working together to reach a common goal.” (Tenner, Dotoro, 1992) The goal of business mostly is to maintain market shares, to increase customer satisfaction or improve the overall performance through cooperation and collaboration. Only members involve in teamwork drive the company to reach a goal such as increasing an organization’s capability, improve performance or enhances customer relationships. (Ortiz, 1996). In Human Resource focus, there are 6 steps: Planning, business focus, communications, teamwork, commitment, and benchmarking. Business found that teamwork is not a one shot quick approach; it must have been around since the beginning of the business, and it is the sharing of responsibilities and decision-making in the business. Whenever a business ignores the performance and people in Teamwork, the business suffers.

Building Teamwork

A business is started by teamwork. In the beginning, everyone in the company knows what the performance standards are and they try to reach it. People in an organization sometimes

forget the purpose of their work. The best ways to help people is **to find** materials at work, getting them closer to the organization.

Tenner and Irving talk about guidelines for building teamwork to increase customer's satisfaction. Information: Businesses need to understand the goal and know the current issues that the company is facing before the team starts working to solve the problem. The goal and the problem that the team needs to know should be written in a document. It consists of three parts: a general description of the problem or opportunity to be addressed, the expected outcome and the boundaries.

When jobs have been done, customers are satisfied. Members in organizations should receive benefits for improving the quality of work life, developing personal skills, rotational job opportunities, and increasing power to make decisions (empowerment).

I would like to talk about when people from several places come to work together as a team. Before a job is started, team members might need time to get to know each other. The team is not easy to start. Participation of members is important for the decision making, skill is also required for individuals to fit the role they are given. Members will increase their expertise as they are trained in one or several of the disciplines.

“Having employees discuss quality customer relationships and guidelines to develop them can help us implement the pull system and job flexibility program”(Beatrice, 1993.) Before teams implement customer relationships, the organization first needs to cultivate employee relationships then they apply it to customers.

Managers prepare jobs for the team. When they know the goal of the organization, they need to know the limit of their responsibilities by structuring jobs with overlapping responsibilities, laying out the work area so that they can see one another's work and designing

procedures with different jobs. For these reasons, they are better able to collaborate. When the executives assign jobs to a team, they should not overlook the way employees behave and work with one another. They should assume that their organization simply is structured from the process of the department. It might cause people to relinquish their function.

Group-Team Decision Making Environment

This part is a summary of a literature reviews of the a continued research of Decision Making Environment of hotels in Rochester, NY which were written by Stubblebine (1994), Chermisrivattana (1996), and Sridhar (1996). The topics include Quality Circle, Total Quality Management, Self-Managing Teams, Benchmarking, customer comes second, empowerment, Longitudinal Study, Decision Making, Workplace Environment, and Management Theories. The following briefly review all of their concepts.

Stubblebine's literature review shows historical issues that have shaped the decision-making process in an organization. At the time he wrote his research, he believed that a traditional organization was not considered to be of use anymore. He pointed out that the trends of decision making over time has shifted from Quality Circles to Total Quality Management to a Self-Managing Team.

Quality Circle is a small team of volunteers who meets regularly to find and solve quality problems. The most important benefit of quality circles is the effect on personal attitude and behavior. On the other hand, Quality Circle sometimes could not be used effectively. The major problem was from a team's inability to gain a perspective or adapt to an external problem. For this reason, Total Quality Management became used in decision-making activities. It is a system of activities directed at achieving satisfied customers, empowering employees, higher revenues,

and lower costs (Stubblebine, 1995). Total Quality Management in his research touched on the use of group decision-making by using six factors of Boone and Kilmann's research, which impacts the effectiveness of decision making in work organizations. In order to adjust to the period of time, a Self-Managing Team became more popular to deal with decision making in existent organizations. Self-Directed Managing is a group of two or more people who share decision power and responsibilities for significant aspects of their individual job. Therefore, a self-managing team will not be successful if the organization does not provide the clear purposes and resources necessary to team development and introduction, and also the condition, which enables the team to continue developing in order to meet their goals. In addition, Benchmarking should be considered as way of copying some other processes or products. It is a measure of a decision making process.

Salaya's literature review is the third year research in Decision-Making Environment. There are additional past from Koo (1994), and Stubblebine (1995)'s research

Customers Come Second, TQM movement will be effective if an organization understands who customers are and what their needs are as well as understanding their employee's needs. In another word, companies become interested in employee needs. Organizations have learned that meeting their employee's expectations directly affects an employee's ability to meet their customer's expectations. This means that if an organization can satisfy the physical, psychological, and educational needs of its employees, employees then will be better able to satisfy the needs of their customers.

Psychologists point out that people both feel and perform better when their perceived control is high and that people seem to cope far better when they believe that they have an ability

to control adverse events (Salaya, 1996). Koo pointed out that empowerment deal with participates management techniques by objectives, quality circles, and goal setting by subordinates as the means of sharing power. It is motivational with a emphasis on personal efficiency. To prove the importance of empowerment, Salaya touched on that by providing trust and support, information, resources and training, follow-up measurements, and reinforcement to employees, then companies can successfully create an empowerment environment.

McHenry gave defined a Self-Directed Team as a highly group fully responsible for turning out a well-defined segment of finished work. Before implementing a self-directed team measurement, an organization needs to ensure that the support management is provided. Therefore, the team will work most effectively when members understand what is important, and by being responsible to their jobs. The most important thing is that an organization should prepare its goal clearly and communicate it well to its members.

In Sridhar's literature review, she updated information that is significant in Decision-Making Environment. The additional topics were Decision-Making, Team Environment and Management Theory. By using a "organizational team survey" to identify the decision making process in an organization. They found two interesting solutions in the questionnaire. It indicated the theoretical model to be several factors, but separate steps in the decision making process and the identification of several factors which relate to the non rational decision making in an organization. It also involves the basics of clear objectives, provision of management support and recognizing effective lines of communication and authority. It is true that decision-making can not be made independently and also it is trues that bureaucratic block and politics in organizations hamper an effective the decision making environment. Management needs to be

more aware of these unexpected activities effecting to decision making process in an organization. Thus a strong organization can happen when management is appreciative of the need to develop a complete package of structure and processes which form the environment conducive to the environment.

The team Environment is everything that happens in a team organization. Based on an alternative philosophical premise many practices now are associated with high performance, such as self-managing work teams, flexibility in job assignments, performance incentives, external contracting, greater concern about company culture, environment and commitment of employees evident in the early years of industrialization. When an organization calls itself a team, team leaders should not be the ones telling members how and what to do. Performance should come out by people brainstorming which should be the best way to solve problems in the team. However, the team still needs clear concepts to make team members understand their duties and goals.

Many experts wrote Management Theory in their own styles. Sridhar brought up theories of James Moncrieff and Janet Smallwood. There are three strategic styles that have dominated the last three decades. It is “the planning style” in 1970, “a visioning style” in 1980, and “a learning style” in 1990. There were three organizational skills that were essential for the future: Sensing, awareness, and responsiveness.

Chapter III

Results and Finding

The purpose of this study is to analyze the collaboration of teamwork and decision making by using the Organization Team Survey, and looking at the attitude of employees at the Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company in Thailand. The results show the factor means comparisons of branches ((1,2), (1,3), (1,4), (2,4), (2,4), and (3,4)) in Kow-Yoo-Hah Motor Company. Eighty percent of questions in the questionnaires were accommodated from Organization Decision Making research by Boone and Kilmann, (1991). The writer provided the rest of all questions in order to adjust to the case study.

Table 1 shows demographic information of the overall organization. The demographics that are shown on the Table1 are Sex of employees, Age of employees, Years of working in this company, Years of working in this position, and Branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah

Table 2 shows sex of respondents by branches. Table 3 shows age of respondents by branches. Tables 6-11 show factor mean comparisons among the branches, which are analyzed from part II in the questionnaires. Fifteen comparisons were found to have statistically significant difference. The answers of the questionnaire were analyzed through group t-test with p-value between 0.10 to 0.01. The survey uses a Likert scale of 1 to 5 is used by ranging from 1 being strongly disagreed to strongly agreed.

Part III in the questionnaires shows range of problem areas. The scale 1 to 5 was used by ranking from 1 being the most concerned problem to 5 being the least concerned problems. Therefore, the means showing on table 8 which are closest to 5 are considered to be the issue of

most concern while the means that are fifth largest are considered to be the issue of least concern.

Demographic information of the overall organization are shown in Table 1. The demographics are listed as the following:

1. Sex of employees: from all the respondents, there were females = 54.3 %, and Male = 45.7%
2. Age of employees: From all the respondents, there were (under 25 year old = 20%), (26-35 year old = 61.1%), 36-45 year old = 16%), (46-55 year old = 2.9%)
3. Number of years working in this company: From all the respondents, respondents have worked for the company for (0-3 years = 43%), (4-6 years = 27.4%), (7-9 years = 10.3%), (10-12 years = 10.3%), and (13 and over = 8.6%)
4. Number of years working in the current positions: From all the respondents who have worked in this position for (0-3 years = 62.9%), (4-6 years = 25.1%), (7-9 years = 4%), (10-12 years = 3.4%), 13 years and over = 4.6%)
5. Branches of kow-Yoo-Hah motor company: From 175 respondents, 20 percent were from Khonkaen Yone branches, 29.7 percent from Sarakram branch, 20.6 percent from Leiy branch, and 29.7 percent from Head office.

Table 1: Demographic Data of respondents

Types	Data of Respondents	
	Frequency (%)	Sample (N)
<u>Sex</u>		
Female	54.3	95
Male	45.7	80
<u>Age</u>		
Under 25	20	35
26 – 35	61.1	107
36 – 45	16	28
46 – 55	2.9	5
<u>Years working in the company</u>		
0 – 3	43.4	76
4 – 6	27.4	48
7 – 9	10.3	18
10 – 12	10.3	18
13 and under	8.6	15
<u>years working in current positions</u>		
0 – 3	62.9	110
4 – 6	25.1	44
7 – 9	4	7
10 – 12	3.4	6
13 and under	4.6	8
<u>Branches of Kow-Yoo-Hah</u>		
Khonkaen Yone	20	35
Sarakram	29.7	52
Leiy	20.6	36
Headoffice	29.7	52

From 175 respondents, table2 shows that there were 20 females and 15 males in Khonkaen Yone branch, 23 females and 29 males in Sarakram branch, 27 females and 9 males in Leiy branch, and 25 females and 27 males in the Head office. There were 54.3% female and 45.7 % male

Table 2: Sex of respondents by branches

Sex	Khonkaen Yone	Sarakram	Leiy	Head office	Total/%
Female	20	23	27	25	95/54.3
Male	15	29	9	27	80/45.7
Total/%	35 20	52 29.7	36 20.6	52 29.7	175 100%

Table 3 displays age of respondents by branches. Seven participants at Khonkaen Yone branch, six participants at Sarakram branch, twelve participants in Leiy branch, and ten participants at Head office were in the age of 25 and younger. twenty participants at Khonkaen Yone, thirty-nine participants at Sarakram branch, twenty-two participants in Leiy branch, and twenty-six participants at Head office were between 26-35 years old. Six participants at Khonkaen Yone, six participants at Sarakram branch, two participants in Leiy branch, and fourteen participants at Head office were between 36-45 years old. Two participants at Khonkaen Yone, only one participants at Sarakram branch, and two participants at Head office were between 36-45 years old.

Table 3: Age of respondents by branches

Age	Khonkaen Yone	Sarakram	Leiy	Head office	Total/%
under 25	7	6	12	10	35/20.0
26 – 35	20	39	22	26	107/61.1
36 – 45	6	6	2	14	28/16.0
46 – 55	2	1	0	2	5/2.9
Total/%	35 20	52 29.7	36 20.6	52 29.7	175 100%

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 1: Factor Means between Branch1 (Khonkaen) and Branch2 (Sarakram)

Between branch1 and 2 comparison, there were four significant differences in the means.

In factor 2- Problem Identification and Organization, the P-value was 0.045 with a t-value of 2.03. P-value is significant at the 0.05 level. The mean of factor 2 in branch 1 (3.8) was higher than the mean in branch 2 (3.55) displaying degree of freedom at 73.76. In factor3- Rewards for Good Decision, the P-value was 0.005 with t-value of 2.89. P-value is significant at the 0.01 level. The mean of factor3 in branch1 (3.76) was higher than the mean of factor 3 in branch 2 (3.25) In factor 6- Resource Adequacy, the P-value was 0.007 with a t-value of 2.81. P-value is significant at the 0.01 level. The mean of factor6 in branch1 (3.56) was higher than the mean in branch2 (3.27). In Factor8- Flexibility in workplace, P-value was 0.071 with t-value of 1.83. P-value is significant at the 0.10 level. The mean of factor8 in branch1 (3.31) is higher than the mean in branch 2 (3.11)

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.005 to 0.912.

(A detailed listing of all values for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 4: Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch (#1) and Sarakram branch (#2)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Problem	1	35	3.8	2.03	75.76	0.045 **
	2	52	3.55			
Rewards	1	35	3.76	2.89	76.99	0.005 ***
	2	52	3.25			
resource	1	35	3.56	2.81	55.98	0.007 ***
	2	52	3.27			
Flexibility	1	35	3.31	1.83	74.84	0.071 *
	2	52	3.11			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 2: Comparison of factor means between branch 1 and branch 3

Between branch 1 and 3 comparison, two significance was detected. In Factor 4- Use group of efforts (Team), the p-value was 0.004 (t-value of -2.95) showing significant at 0.01 level. The mean of branch 1 was 2.8, which was higher than branch 3 (2.28). It showed degree of freedom at 68.07.

In Factor 9- Hold back for making decision (Restrain), the p-value was 0.036 (t-value of – 2.14) which is significant at 0.05 level. It showed 68.09 degree of freedom. The mean of branch 1 was 2.5, which was lower than the mean in branch 3 (2.85).

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.004 to 0.809.

(A detailed listing of all values for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 5: Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch (#1) and Leiy branch (#3)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Teams	1	35	2.8	-2.95	68.07	0.004 ***
	Vs					
	3	36	3.28			
Restrain	1	35	2.5	-2.14	68.09	0.036 **
	Vs					
	3	36	2.85			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 3: Comparison of Factor means between branch 1 and branch 4

Between branch 1 and branch 4 comparison, there were four significant differences among factors.

In Problem Identification and Organization factor, the p-value was 0.017 (t-value of 2.45) which shows significant at 0.05 level. The degree of freedom was 79.81. It shows that the mean of branch 1 (3.8) was higher than the mean of branch 4 (3.48).

In Rewards for Good Decision factor, the p-value is 0.031 (t-value of 2.21) which shows significant at 0.05 level. The mean of branch 1 (3.76) was higher than the mean in branch 4 (3.41) with the degree of freedom at 63.48.

In Resource Adequacy factor, the p-value was 0.029 (t-value of 2.23) which shows significant at 0.05 level. The mean of branch 1 (3.56) was higher than the mean of branch 4 (3.31), displaying 65.90 degree of freedom.

In Leadership factor, the p-value was 0.014 (t-value if 2.51) which shows significant at 0.05 level. The mean of branch 1 (4.24) was higher than the mean of branch 4 (3.90) showing 83.92 degree of freedom.

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.014 to 0.594.

(A detailed listing of all values for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 6: Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone branch (#1), and Head office (#4)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Problem	1	35	3.8	2.45	79.81	0.017 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.48			
Rewards	1	35	3.76	2.21	63.48	0.031 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.41			
resource	1	35	3.56	2.23	65.9	0.029 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.31			
Leadership	1	35	4.24	2.51	83.92	0.014 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.9			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 4: Comparison of factor means between branch 2 and branch 3

Between branch 2 and 3 comparison, there were three significant differences in the mean among factors.

In Rewards for Good Decision factor, the p-value was 0.064 (t-value of -1.88) which shows significant at 0.10 level. The mean of branch 2 (3.25) was lower than the mean of branch 3 (3.55) displaying 85.04 degree of freedom.

In Use of Group Efforts factor, the p-value was 0.007 with a t-value of -2.78 which shows significant at 0.01 level. The mean of branch 2 (2.92) was lower than the mean of branch 3 (3.28) showing 62.72 degree of freedom.

In Hold back for Making Decision factor, the p-value was 0.017 with a t-value of 2.45 which shows significant at 0.05 level. The mean of branch 2 (2.47) was lower than the mean of branch 3 (2.85) showing 74.03 degree of freedom.

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.007 to 0.877.

(A detailed listing of all value for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 7: Comparison of factor means between Sarakram branch (#2) and Leiy branch(#3)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Rewards	2	52	3.25	-1.88	85.04	0.064 *
	vs 3	36	3.55			
Teams	2	52	2.92	-2.78	62.72	0.007 ***
	vs 3	36	3.28			
Restrain	2	52	2.47	-2.45	74.03	0.017 **
	vs 3	36	2.85			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 5: Comparison of factor means between branch 2 and branch 4

Between branch 2 and 4 comparison, there was one significant difference among the factors. In Leadership of Members factor, the p-value was 0.059 (t-value of 1.91) which shows significant at 0.10 level. The mean of branch 2 (4.17) was higher than the mean of branch 4 (3.90) showing 99.79 degree of freedom.

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.059 to 0.879.

(A detailed listing of all value for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 8: comparison of leadership factor means between Sarakram branch (#2) and Head office (#4)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Leadership	2	52	4.17	1.91	99.70	0.059 *
	vs 4	52	3.9			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Category 6: comparison of factor means between branch 3 and 4

Between branch 3 and 4 comparison, the “Use of the group effort factor was significant difference with the p-value was 0.014 (t-value at 2.51) which is significant at 0.05 level. The mean of branch 3 (3.29) was higher than the mean of branch 4 (2.9) showing 81.78 degree of freedom.

Among the rest of the factors, there was no significance. The p-value ranged from 0.014 to 0.595. (A detailed listing of all value for this category is in Appendix B)

Table 9: Comparison of Team factor means between Leiy branch (3#) and Head office (#4)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Teams	3	36	3.28	2.51	81.78	0.014 ***
	vs 4	52	2.9			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Ranking of the five problem areas

According to table10, it showed the top five problem ranking areas in these four branches. In branch1 (Khonkaen Yone), cooperation of co-workers was the first concerned problem area showing the mean of 2.74. The second concerned problem was company policy and strategies with the mean of 2.37. The third problem was motivation to do job better with the mean of 2.20. The fourth problem was finance and budgeting problem with the mean of 1.63 and the last concern problem was good knowledge in job with the mean of 1.57.

In branch2 (Sarakram), the top problem which management should improve was company policy and strategies with the mean of 3.81. The second highest concern was finance and budgeting with the mean of 2.87. The third one was motivation to do job better with the mean of 1.83. The fourth problem was customer complaints with the mean of 1.29. And the fifth problem was adequate training to do job.

In branch3 (Leiy), the first concern problem was finance and budgeting with the mean of 3.14. The second one was company policy and strategies with the mean of 2.36. Motivation to do

job better was the third problem with the mean of 2.22. The fourth problem was adequate training to do job with the mean of 1.72. The last problem should be concerned was equipment and supplies to do job with the mean of 1.14.

In branch4 (headquarter), the worst problem was company policy and strategies with the mean of 3.33. The second problem was finance and budgeting with the mean of 2.37. Motivation to do job better was the third concerned problem with the mean of 1.94. The following problem was adequate training to do job with the mean of 1.19. The last problem was personnel problem with the mean of 1.13.

This showed that employees in different branches have different opinion about the worst problem in their branches. However one thing that we can see on the table was motivation to do job better was the third concerned problem in every branch. If we look at the whole organization, the motivation to do job better should be the first concerned problem that the executive should take into consideration.

Table 10: Ranking of Problem areas by branches

Variable	Head office		Khonkaen		Sarakram		Leiy	
	Mean	Rank#	Mean	Rank#	Mean	Rank#	Mean	Rank#
Company policy and strategies	3.33	(1)	2.37	(2)	3.81	(1)	2.36	(2)
Finance and budgeting	2.37	(2)	1.63	(4)	2.87	(2)	3.14	(1)
Motivation to do job better	1.94	(3)	2.2	(3)	1.83	(3)	2.22	(3)
Adequate training to do job	1.19	(4)	1.26		1.12	(5)	1.72	(4)
Personnel	1.13	(5)	0.2		0.54		0.67	
Staff Turnover	1.00		1.03		0.77		0.33	
Computer system	0.63		0.74		0.73		0.47	
Equipment and supply to do job	0.21		0.54		0.23		1.14	(5)
Good Knowledge in job	0.98		1.57	(5)	0.58		0.72	
Safety in workplace	0.15		0.31		0.12		0.47	
Paper work	0.33		0.23		0.23		0.11	
Cooperation of co-workers	1.10		2.74	(1)	0.88		0.61	
Customer complaints	0.56		0.31		1.29	(4)	0.88	

Chapter IV

Conclusions

With the factor means in six comparisons of: (Khonkaen Yone & Sarakram), (khonkean Yone & Leiy), (Khonkaen & Head office), (Sarakram & Leiy), (Sarakram & Head office), and (Leiy & Head office), there were 175 employees of Kow-Yoo-Hah company participated in the survey about teamwork and the decision making environment. The hypothesis stated that teamwork and decision making processes between branches are different. Fifteen factor means were found to have a significant difference with a P-value between 0.1 and 0.01. The following shows how different factors were in the six comparisons.

- 1) The comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone and Sarakram branches.

There were 35 respondents from the Khonkaen Yone branch and 52 respondents from the Sarakram branch. Four factor means were found to have a statistically significant difference. Factor 2: Problem identification and organization, the results found that the Khonkaen Yone branch had a clearer objective to identify problem by using employees who had better skills and reliability. Factor 3: Rewards for good decisions made by employees at the Khonkaen Yone branch were happier. They were more effective in their performance. Factor 6: Resource Adequacy, the higher mean showed that physical tools in the decision making process at the Khonkaen Yone branch was better than the Sarakram branch. Factor 8: Flexibilities in the workplace. The mean indicates that the management in Khonkaen Yone branch was more flexible than the Sarakram branch and employees were allowed free expression.

- 2) The comparison of factor means between the Khonkaen Yone and Leiy branches.

There were 35 respondents at the Khonkaen Yone branch and 36 respondents at the Leiy branch. Two factor means were found to have a statistically significant difference. Factor 4: Use of group effort, employees at the Leiy branch used teams in the decision making process more than the Khonkaen Yone branches. Factor 9: in holding for making decision, employees at the Leiy branch more confident to share their ideas in a team during decision making process.

3) The comparison of factor means between the Khonkaen Yone and Head office branches. With thirty-five respondents at the Khonkaen Yone branch and fifty-two respondents from the Head office, the higher mean showed that the Khonkaen Yone branch had a better impact on the effective of decision making in the workplace. Factor 2: Problem identification and organization. Through better skills and organization at the teamwork at Khonkaen Yone branch, identified their problems and set clear objectives. Factor 3: Rewards for good decisions making and problem identification were given at the Khonkaen Yone branch. Factor 6: Resource Adequacy, the higher mean showed that the decision makers in the team used better physical tools to train their employees and to get them to work hard for the company. The last supporting factor was Leadership of members, the Khonkaen Yone branch had better capability in taking a leadership role to support their decision making.

4) Comparison of factor means between the Sarakram and Leiy branches. With fifty-two respondents from Sarakram and thirty-six respondents at the branch, three factor means were found to have a significant difference. Factor 4: Team and Use of group effort, the result indicated that employees at the Leiy branch were encouraged to participate in the decision making process more than employees at Sarakram. Factor 9: Restraint or Hold back for decision making, the result displayed that employees at the Leiy branch had a better ability to work for company.

5) Comparison of factor means between Sarakram and Head office.

From fifty-two respondents at the Sarakram branch and the fifty-two respondents at the Head office, there was only one factor found to statistically significant difference which was factor 7: Leadership of members, the mean showed that employees at the Sarakram branch had a better ability to solve their problems by respecting everyone's point of view and supporting team decisions.

6) Comparison of factor means between the Leiy branch and Head office.

From the thirty-six respondents at the Leiy branch and fifty-two respondents from the Head office, only factor 4: teamwork and use of group efforts was found to have statistically significant difference. The mean of the Leiy branch indicated that the Leiy branch used teams in the decision making process more than the Head office.

Recommendation

Table 8 shows the ranking of problem areas at the four branches of the Kow-Yoo-Hah motor company. The following lists problem areas at the four branches.

- 1) Head office; Company policy and strategies, Finance and budgeting, Motivation to do job better, Adequate training to do job, and Personnel problem.
- 2) Khonkaen branch; Cooperation of co-workers, company policy and strategies, Motivation to do a job better, Finance and budgeting, and Good knowledge in job.
- 3) Sarakram branch; Company policy and strategies, Finance and budgeting, Motivation to do job better, customer complaints, and adequate training.
- 4) Leiy Branch; Finance and budgeting, company policy and strategies, Motivation to do a job better, adequate training to do job, and equipment and supplies to do the job.

We can see that the management in each branch should take into consideration the top five problem areas, and try to solve the problems. Three branches had several different problem areas that should be addressed in these individual branches. There are:

- Khonkaen Yone branch should improve the “Cooperation of coworker” and also “Good Knowledge in job”.
- Sarakram branch should find out what the "Customer's Complaints" are and improve their services; otherwise, customer dissatisfaction will increase more in a short time.
- The Leiy should be given more “Equipment and supplies” to help employees at the branch perform their jobs.

The aforementioned suggestions are ways to solve problem in their own branches. By looking at the ranking number of the Head office and others in table 8, the ranking of problems for the whole organization are as a follows:

- Problems number one and two are company policy and strategies, and Finance and budgeting. Therefore, the company needs to find out what needs to be improved.
- Problem number 3 are Motivation to do the job better. People work for business because they expect to be fairly compensated from the organization. For instance, rewards that are based on performance. They may take the form of a bonus, raise, or nonfinancial recognition.
- Problem number four and five are Adequate training to do the job and personnel problem. Both problems are related. It might start from the company policy. The company should have a clear objective and have people in the right position. After hiring employees, the company should train them sufficiently. Especially, mechanical and customer service employees should be trained before interacting with customers.

Furthermore, the big companies, which are successful in business, say that teamwork is essential in achieving their goals to support the group decision. Consensus building takes time and should involve all team members in discussion to ensure that all are stated and understood by all members of the team.

Reference

- Alonzo, V. (1994) Shifting gears. Incentive. 168, 8, 76
- Belsky, G.(1996) Watch out: Car-repair crooks have some new tricks up their grimy sleeves, Money, 25, 6, 172.
- Benson, T.E. (1992) Quality and Teamwork: Get a Leg Up. Industry week. (April) 241, 7, 66.
- Boone, L.W., & kilmann, R.H. (1991). The context of decision making in organization: A factor Analysis. Advances in Information Processing in Organization, 4,147-160.
- Boudette, N.E. (1990) Give Me a 'T!' Give Ma an 'E!' industry week. (January), 239, 1, 62-65.
- Chermsirivatana, S. (1996). Assessment of change in the decision making environment in Rochester, N.Y.hotel: a 1996 case study. Unpublished master project. Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.
- European Consumer Law Group Servicing Of Car And Electrica. Journal of Consumer Policy. (1989, December) pp.485-517.
- Frohman, M.A. (1995) Do teams ... But do them right. Industry Week. (April), 244, 7, 21.
- Greenberg, H.M. (1996) Building peak performance teams. Agency Sales. (January), 26, 1, 28.
- Klein, E. & Izzo, J. (1996) Corporate soul for competitive advantage. Association Management. (August), 48, 8, 104.
- Hammering home performance incentives, (1996, May). Nation's Business. P10.

- LaFASTO, Frank M.J. (1989) Teamwork : what must go right, what can go wrong. California. : SAGE Publication. (pp15-25)
- Lightle, S. & Talbott, J. (1995) A case against individual performance : budgeting, The CPA Journal. (April), 65, 4, 30.
- McCoy, T.A. (1994) The auto service business : A big market of small shops, Rough Notes. (December), 137, 12, 32.
- McSparran, K. & Edmunds, K. (1996) The blinders of functional management, Beverage World. (December), 115, 1630, 125.
- Michael, F. & Colin, H. (1997) Implement Teamwork. Executive Excellence. (July), 14, 7, 17.
- Majchrzak, A. & Wang, Q. (1996) Breaking the functional mind-set in process organizations, Harvard Business Review. (September-October), 74, 5, 92.
- Mumma, S. F (1992) Team-Work & Team-Roles (Revised), Organization Design and Development.
- Ortiz, C. (1996) Implementation issues : A recipe for scheduling success, IIIE Solution. (March), 28, 3, 28.
- Rees, T. (1991) How to lead work team : facilitation skills. California, Pfeiffer & co., (pp.7-12)
- Six steps to success. (1997, June) HR Focus. p.11.
- Sridhar, N. (1996). Assessment of chances in the decision making environment in Rochester N.Y. hotel: a 1996 case study. Unpublished master project, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.

- Stubblebine, D. (1995). Assessment of chances in the decision making environment in Rochester N.Y. hotel: a case study. Unpublished master project, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.
- Taninecz, G. (1996) What went wrong?, Industry Week. (December), 245, 23, 45-56.
- Teeter, D.J. & Lozier, G.G. (1993) Pursuit of Quality in Higher Education: Case Studies in Total Quality Management. California, Jossey-Bass. (pp.57-58)
- Tenner, A.R. & DeToro, I.J. (1992) Total Quality Management. Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley publishing company. (pp.183-186)
- Tjosvold, D. (1993) Teamwork for customers : building organization the take pride in serving. California, Jossey-Bass. (pp.106-111)
- Waldman, D.A. (1997) Predictor of Employee Preferences for Multirater and Group-Based Performance Appraisal. Group & Organization Management, Arizona State University West (June), 22, 2, 264- 287.
- Zoglio, S. (1995) Teams at work, Executive excellence. (June), 12, 6, 19.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Teamwork and Decision Making environment Survey

Teamwork Measurement in Auto Repair Service department at Kow-yoo-Hah

Note to Participant: This is a survey of Siriruk Angsanant, a current graduate student of Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, USA. The majority of the questions are developed from the research, "Measurement of the Team Decision Making Environment" by Edward Stockham, Ph.D. Food, Hotel, and Travel Management, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, and USA.

Part1 Before answering the questions on this survey (Part2), Please think of your current jobs, then briefly describe your responsibility in the work process.

Part2

Instruction: Please read the following statement. Then choose the extent that you agree or disagree with each statement. Circle the response that best describe what you think by using the scale:

NA = applicable; SD = Strongly disagree; D = disagree; U = uncertain; A = agree; SA = strong agree

1. The company has adequate access to equipment like calculators, computers, telephone, tools, etc. to allow everyone to do good work.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
2. People who offer good ideas are fairly rewarded.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
3. Decision-makers want to hear deferent points of view.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
4. Management provides enough support to carry out decisions.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
5. People involve in decision make sure they identify the real (right) problem.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
6. It is easy to get things done because decision-makers know who is in charge and who to ask for help.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
7. People working on problems have the skills needed to solve them.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
8. There are a lot of "steps" to go through before anything can be accomplished.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
9. People who make good decision receive the rewards they deserve.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
10. Decision-makers have access to relevant information from all levels of the company.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA

11. The equipment (calculators, computers, tools, etc.) used to aid decision making in this company works reliably.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
12. One or a few people dominate decisions in this company.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
13. This company has good ways to measure the performance of its member.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
14. Decision-makers appreciate and take advantage of each other's differences, strengths, and unique capabilities.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
15. Decisions are usually made by individuals, not teams of people in this company.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
16. The reward system is designed to benefit members who solve the company's problems.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
17. There are not enough physical resources such as tools, computing equipment, office space, communication systems, supplies to support good decision-making.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
18. There are too many policies and procedures controlling decisions.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
19. Employees are encouraged to try new ideas in this company.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
20. Changes are usually opposed in this company because they cost too much.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
21. This company often uses special groups like project teams, and work groups to address problems that sometimes come up.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
22. Adequate rewards are provided to encourage employees to offer new ideas.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
23. Information about a problem is obtained from many different sources.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
24. Information about problems is accurate.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
25. There is a lot of bribery activity when decisions are made.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
26. Clear objectives are set for decisions.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
27. Decision-makers are willing to take some risks.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
28. Employees feel free to disagree with management.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
29. People are encouraged to discuss problems with other company employees when making decision	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
30. There are a few powerful people in this company who always influence decisions.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
31. Many possible solutions to problems are generated and considered.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
32. Important decisions are usually made by upper management only.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
33. What you are trying to accomplish is meaningful to team.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
34. You sometimes accept ideas of poor quality because they are orders.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
35. You can find several ways of approaching any assignment	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
36. You sometimes surprise or shock others with some unexpected behavior.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
37. You find ways for others to contribute to the goal of the group.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
38. You sometimes listen too much to what others have to say.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
39. You sometimes avoid taking a leadership role when you could.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
40. Producing ideas is one of your naturals.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
41. You come to life when the group brainstorms ways to solve a problem.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA

42. You try to steer the group's thinking in the right direction in making decisions.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
43. You try to support all good suggestions made in a discussion.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
44. Your leadership helps the group heading towards agree-upon goal.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
45. You are interested in everyone's point of view.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA
46. You rarely have a chance to tell your team how you feel with the working process.	NA	SD	D	U	A	SA

Part3 Rating of Problem Areas

Based on your past experience, please pick the top 5 problem areas in your operation from the list below and rank those 5 areas from 1 (most probable area) to 5 (the fifth probably area).

- () Company Policies or strategies
- () Personnel
- () Finance and Budgeting
- () Customer Complaints
- () Adequate Training to do job
- () Motivation to do job better
- () Staff Turnover
- () Computer System
- () Equipment and Supplies to do job
- () Good Knowledge in job
- () Safety in Work Place
- () Paper Work
- () Cooperation of Co-workers

Part4 Additional Information for Data Analysis

The information you provide below will be held in strictest confidence and used only for data analysis. We truly appreciate your voluntary participation in this assessment of the department and the company's workplace environment.

Sex: ()Female () Male

Age: ()Under 25 () 26-35 () 36-45 () 46-55 () over56

Number of years working in auto service department:

() 0-3 () 4-6 () 7-9 () 10-12 () over 13

Number of years working in this company: () 0-3 () 4-6 () 7-9 () 10-12 () over 13

Number of years working in Current position: () 0-3 () 4-6 () 7-9 () 10-12 () over 13

We appreciate your voluntary participation in this study conducted by RIT, school of Food, Hotel and Travel Management.

Appendix B

Detailed Table for t-Tests

(Table 11 through 16)

Table11: Comparison of factor means between of Khonekaen Yone branch (#1) and Sarakram branch (#2)

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	1	35	3.8	1.64	73.23	0.105
	vs					
	2	52	3.58			
Problem	1	35	3.8	2.03	73.76	0.045 **
	vs					
	2	52	3.55			
Rewards	1	35	3.76	2.89	76.99	0.005 ***
	vs					
	2	52	3.25			
Teams	1	35	2.8	-0.85	56.61	0.339
	vs					
	2	52	2.92			
Politics	1	35	3.53	0.11	65.98	0.912
	vs					
	2	52	3.51			
Resource	1	35	3.56	2.81	55.98	0.007 ***
	vs					
	2	52	3.27			
Leadership	1	35	4.24	0.52	86.92	0.606
	vs					
	2	52	4.18			
Flexibility	1	35	3.31	1.83	74.84	0.071 *
	vs					
	2	52	3.11			
Restrained	1	35	2.5	0.25	78.54	0.801
	vs					
	2	52	2.47			
Ideas	1	35	3.42	0.96	59.76	0.339
	vs					
	2	52	3.31			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

**Table12: Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone
branch (#1) and Leiy branch (#3)**

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	1	35	3.8	0.96	66.74	0.343
	vs 3	36	3.67			
Problem	1	35	3.8	1.38	68.65	0.171
	vs 3	36	3.61			
Rewards	1	35	3.76	1.23	66.08	0.223
	vs 3	36	3.55			
Teams	1	35	2.8	-2.95	68.07	0.004 ***
	vs 3	36	3.28			
Politics	1	35	3.53	0.22	59.8	0.825
	vs 3	36	3.49			
Resource	1	35	3.56	0.8	68.45	0.426
	vs 3	36	3.45			
Leadership	1	35	4.24	0.54	53.73	0.588
	vs 3	36	4.15			
Flexibility	1	35	3.31	0.97	67.32	0.334
	vs 3	36	3.19			
Restrain	1	35	2.5	-2.14	68.09	0.036 **
	vs 3	36	2.85			
Ideas	1	35	3.42	-0.24	68.88	0.809
	vs 3	36	3.45			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Table13: Comparison of factor means between Khonkaen Yone**Branch (#1) and Head office (#4)**

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	1	35	3.8	1.44	75.29	0.155
	vs					
	4	52	3.6			
Problem	1	35	3.8	2.45	79.81	0.017 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.48			
Rewards	1	35	3.76	2.21	63.48	0.031 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.41			
Teams	1	35	2.8	-0.62	75.93	0.536
	vs					
	4	52	2.9			
Politics	1	35	3.53	1.05	71.63	0.298
	vs					
	4	52	3.39			
Resource	1	35	3.56	2.23	65.9	0.029 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.31			
Leadership	1	35	4.24	2.51	83.92	0.014 **
	vs					
	4	52	3.9			
Flexibility	1	35	3.31	0.68	64.83	0.499
	vs					
	4	52	3.24			
Restrain	1	35	2.5	-1.36	83.46	0.177
	vs					
	4	52	2.72			
Ideas	1	35	3.42	0.54	70.49	0.594
	vs					
	4	52	3.35			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Table14: Comparison of factor means between**Sarakram branch (#2) and Leiy branch (#3)**

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	2	52	3.58	-0.74	82.24	0.46
	3	36	3.67			
Problem	2	52	3.55	-0.44	71.06	0.664
	3	36	3.61			
Rewards	2	52	3.25	-1.88	85.04	0.064 *
	3	36	3.55			
Teams	2	52	2.92	-2.78	62.72	0.007 ***
	3	36	3.28			
Politics	2	52	3.51	0.16	50.04	0.873
	3	36	3.49			
Resource	2	52	3.27	-1.63	53.52	0.108
	3	36	3.45			
Leadership	2	52	4.18	0.16	62.54	0.877
	3	36	4.15			
Flexibility	2	52	3.11	-0.61	67.71	0.543
	3	36	3.19			
Restrain	2	52	2.47	-2.45	74.03	0.017 **
	3	36	2.85			
Ideas	2	52	3.31	-1.21	58.74	0.231
	3	36	3.45			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Table15: Comparison of factor means between Sarakram**branch (#2)and Head office (#4)**

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	2	52	3.58	-0.19	101.82	0.846
	4	52	3.6			
Problem	2	52	3.55	0.58	100.2	0.565
	4	52	3.48			
Rewards	2	52	3.25	-1.07	95.27	0.288
	4	52	3.41			
Teams	2	52	2.92	0.15	89.06	0.879
	4	52	2.9			
Politics	2	52	3.51	1.13	100.76	0.263
	4	52	3.39			
Resource	2	52	3.27	-0.54	97.56	0.588
	4	52	3.31			
Leadership	2	52	4.17	1.91	99.79	0.059 *
	4	52	3.9			
Flexibility	2	52	3.11	-1.44	98.21	0.154
	4	52	3.24			
Restrain	2	52	2.47	-1.65	99.84	0.101
	4	52	2.72			
Ideas	2	52	3.31	-0.46	97.49	0.648
	4	52	3.35			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level

Table16: Comparison of factor means between Leiy**Branch (#3) and Head office (#4)**

Factors	VS	Sample Size (N)	Mean	T-value	df	p-value
Input	3	36	3.76	0.53	83.56	0.595
	vs 4	52	3.6			
Problem	3	36	3.61	0.92	77.68	0.361
	vs 4	52	3.48			
Rewards	3	36	3.55	1.01	75.09	0.314
	vs 4	52	3.41			
Teams	3	36	3.28	2.51	81.78	0.014 ***
	vs 4	52	2.9			
Politics	3	36	3.49	0.54	53.62	0.594
	vs 4	52	3.39			
Resource	3	36	3.45	1.17	62.43	0.246
	vs 4	52	3.31			
Leadership	3	36	4.15	1.36	69.94	0.179
	vs 4	52	3.9			
Flexibility	3	36	3.19	-0.5	58.37	0.621
	vs 4	52	3.24			
Restrain	3	36	2.85	0.8	80.77	0.426
	vs 4	52	2.72			
Ideas	3	36	3.45	0.78	69.13	0.435
	vs 4	52	3.35			

* significant at the 0.10 level

** significant at the 0.05 level

*** significant at the 0.01 level